



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,915	03/26/2004	Miroslav R. Petrov	6570P026	6336

8791 7590 02/08/2007
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

HASSAN, RASHEDUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2109

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/814,915

Applicant(s)

PETROV ET AL.

Examiner

Rashedul Hassan

Art Unit

2109

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All - b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

For claims 25-30, an electronically accessible medium providing instructions for carrying out the steps of the invention has been claimed. However, according to the disclosure, system interconnection 1170 which includes optical, electronic, acoustical, and other propagated signal lines (specification, [00069]), provides communication between various elements of computing device 1100 and thus constitutes an electronically accessible medium providing instructions for carrying out the steps of the invention. This raises the rebuttable presumption that the applicant intends to include signal or carrier waves as the claimed "electronically accessible medium". Since a signal or carrier wave is not a tangible physical article or object to constitute a machine, manufacture or composition of matter, and it is not a process either, these claims do not fall within a statutory category of invention and thus rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2109

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 2, 10-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ismael et al. (US 6,356,931) hereinafter Ismael.

2. For claims 1-2 (method), 15-16 (apparatus), 20-21(system) and 25-26 (an article of manufacture), Ismael teaches displaying a representation of a plurality of management beans (MBeans, 29 in Fig. 3) registered with an MBean server (Framework 24 in Fig. 3, also column 5 line 5) on a graphical user interface of a computing device (browser of managed station 20 in Fig. 1) wherein one of the plurality of MBeans displayed in the graphical user interface is selectable in order to access an attribute of the selected MBean with the graphical user interface (Summary of the invention, column 2 lines 31-43). Ismael further teaches that the network has a cluster architecture (column 3 lines 40-53) and that each of the displayed MBeans represents a manageable resource within a cluster of application servers (column 5 lines 53-54).

3. It is noted that for claims 20-24, 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph has not been invoked even though means plus function language has been used because the claim language fails to meet the third prong of the 3-prong analysis. The phrase "means for" has been modified by sufficient structure or material (a graphical user interface) in these claims.

4. For claims 10 and 11, Ismael implicitly teaches selecting one of the plurality of displayed MBeans with a pointing device or a keyboard (9 in Fig. 2).
5. Claims 12 (method), 18 (apparatus), 23 (system) and 29 (article of manufacture) are directed to accessing an attribute of an MBean representing a cluster manager of the network. A "cluster manager" according to Fig. 12 and the specification is a component or resource to be monitored that is used for communicating messages between various application resources of the system. Since the system disclosed by Ismael necessarily requires such communication resource for communicating messages between various application resources in order to function as a system and since all resources to be monitored can be represented as MBeans and since all MBeans can be represented and their attributes accessed using a graphical user interface according to Ismael, it follows that Ismael inherently teaches accessing an attribute of an MBean representing a cluster manager of the network.
6. For claims 14 (method), 19 (apparatus), 24 (system) and 30 (article of manufacture), Ismael teaches invoking an operation of the selected MBean with the graphical user interface (column 2 lines 29-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ismael in view of Yeluripati et al. (US 7,086,065) hereinafter Yeluripati.

8. For claim 13, Ismael does not teach accessing a queue size attribute of the MBean representing the cluster manager to determine a number of requests waiting in the queue. However, using a queue to process requests is a well-known mechanism used in the art. Yeluripati teaches a functional bean that receives client requests from a queue to service the request in a first come first serve basis (column 7 lines 45-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to use a queue to service the requests in a MBean representing the cluster manager and subsequently access the queue size attribute of the MBean to determine a number of requests waiting in the queue. The motivation for using a queue would have been to serve the requests in a first come first serve basis (Yeluripati, column 7 lines 45-54) and the motivation for accessing the queue size attribute would have been to monitor the cluster manager performance.

9. Claims 3-9, 17, 22, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ismael in view of Hessmer et al. (US2002/0112044) hereinafter Hessmer.

10. Ismael does not teach displaying a representation of a plurality of hierarchically organized MBeans as a tree structure having a root node, wherein the root node is an MBean representing the cluster of application servers. He does not teach that the tree structure further includes one or more server nodes depending from the root node and showing kernel nodes, library nodes and service nodes depending from each of the one or more server nodes, wherein all these nodes are MBeans. Hessmer teaches a method and system for performing remote diagnostics on a process data access server, wherein he teaches displaying a set of diagnostic roots in the form of a hierarchical tree structure in the left pane of the graphical user interface associated with the diagnostic utility 100 (Fig. 4, [0056]). These diagnostic roots are elements to be monitored organized according to the type of elements. Hessmer's hierarchical tree structure organizes the presentation of the diagnostic roots having a root representing the cluster of servers and then showing a list of servers depending from the root and further showing various diagnostic roots depending from each of the servers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate this aspect of Hessmer's teaching with that of Ismael to represent the plurality of MBeans, each representing a manageable resource, in a hierarchical tree structure and organized in groups under respective server nodes as kernel, service and library nodes respectively based on the type of the resource. The motivation for using a hierarchical tree structure for representing the MBeans in various groups would have been to provide scalability of elements to expose lower levels and their associated information

Art Unit: 2109

and further to provide ready access to a broad spectrum of diagnostic data via a graphical user interface (Hessmer, [0056]).

Relevant Prior Art

11. Following are the prior arts made of record as being pertinent to applicant's disclosure and not relied upon in this office action: Viswanath et al. (US 2004/0019662), Pfeiffer et al. (US 2004/0078722), Hammond (US 6,336,118), Pteit (US 2005/0198285), Renaud (US 2003/0069969), Frey (US 2004/0194066) and Petrov et al. (US 2005/0216860).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rashedul Hassan whose telephone number is 571-272-9481. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30AM-5PM EST and Alt Fri 7:30AM-5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Stucker can be reached on 571-272-9821. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

Art Unit: 2109

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



(Rashedul Hassan)



JEFFREY STUCKER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER